



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/188
22 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Draft resolution

The Security Council,

Reaffirming its resolution 782 (1992) of 13 October 1992 and all subsequent resolutions,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) dated 28 January 1994 (S/1994/89 and Add.1 and 2), and having completed the review of the status of ONUMOZ called for in its resolution 882 (1993),

Commending the efforts of the Secretary-General, his Special Representative and the personnel of ONUMOZ in seeking to implement fully the mandate entrusted to it,

Commending also the role played by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), through the Special Representative of its Secretary-General, in the implementation of the General Peace Agreement for Mozambique (S/24635, annex),

Reiterating the importance it attaches to the General Peace Agreement, and to the timely fulfilment in good faith by all parties of their obligations under the Agreement,

Noting that the people of Mozambique bear the ultimate responsibility for the successful implementation of the General Peace Agreement,

Welcoming recent positive developments in the implementation of the General Peace Agreement, but concerned none the less at delays in its full implementation,

Taking note of the request by the Government of Mozambique and RENAMO concerning the monitoring of all police activities and additional tasks set out in the agreements of 3 September 1993 (S/26432), and of the agreement of both parties to the general concept for the ONUMOZ police contingent,

Stressing the necessity, in this as in other peace-keeping operations, to continue to monitor expenditures carefully during this period of increasing demands on peace-keeping resources, without jeopardizing their purposes,

Noting with appreciation in this context that the Secretary-General, in proposing the establishment of a police component as an integral part of ONUMOZ, has at the same time stated his intention to present specific proposals for the phased reduction of the military component of ONUMOZ, without prejudice to the effective discharge of its mandate, in particular the tasks of its military component,

Reaffirming its conviction that the resolution of the conflict in Mozambique will contribute to peace and security,

1. Welcomes the report of the Secretary-General of 28 January 1994;
2. Authorizes the establishment of a United Nations police component of up to 1,144 personnel as an integral part of ONUMOZ with the mandate and deployment described in paragraphs 9 to 18 of document S/1994/89/Add.1;
3. Requests the Secretary-General, as the police contingent is being deployed, to begin immediately preparing specific proposals for the drawdown of an appropriate number of military personnel with the objective of ensuring there is no increase in the cost of ONUMOZ without prejudice to the effective discharge of its mandate;
4. Further requests the Secretary-General to prepare a timetable for (a) the completion of ONUMOZ's mandate, withdrawal of its personnel, and turnover of any remaining functions to United Nations agencies and programmes by the target date of the end of November 1994, by which time the elected government is expected to have assumed office, and in this context, for (b) the phased drawdown of military forces in the transportation corridors which should begin as soon as feasible and be completed when the new national defence force is operational, and (c) the withdrawal of military observers after demobilization is completed;
5. Welcomes recent positive developments in the implementation of the General Peace Agreement including the commencement of the assembly of troops and the dismantling of paramilitary forces, militia and irregular troops, the approval of the electoral law and the appointment of the National Elections Commission and of its chairperson;
6. Expresses its concern, however, at the continuing delay in the implementation of some major aspects of the General Peace Agreement, including the commencement of demobilization and the formation of a national defence force and calls upon the parties to work towards the elimination of further delays;
7. Calls upon the Government of Mozambique and RENAMO to comply with all the provisions of the General Peace Agreement, in particular those concerning the cease-fire and the cantonment and demobilization of troops, and commends in this respect the commitments made by both President Chissano and Mr. Dhlakama to implement the General Peace Agreement;
8. Further calls upon the Government of Mozambique and RENAMO to comply fully and promptly with the decisions of the Monitoring and Supervision Commission;

9. Encourages the Government of Mozambique to continue to fulfil its commitments in respect of the provision of logistic support and adequate food, and making outstanding payments, to the troops in the assembly areas and the training centres;

10. Notes the recent acceleration in the assembly of the troops of the Government of Mozambique, and calls upon the Government to redouble its efforts to achieve balance between the parties in the cantonment of troops and an expeditious and timely conclusion of this process as called for in the revised timetable;

11. Underlines the need for the troops of the Government of Mozambique and RENAMO to hand over all weapons to the United Nations at the assembly areas and for the parties to come to an immediate agreement on the transfer of all weapons to regional depots so as to ensure security in the assembly areas;

12. Reiterates the vital importance it attaches to the holding of general elections no later than October 1994 and to the early commencement of electoral registration and other electoral preparations, and urges the parties to agree promptly on a specific election date;

13. Appeals to the international community to provide the necessary financial assistance to facilitate the implementation of the General Peace Agreement and also to make voluntary financial contributions to the Trust Fund to be set up to support electoral activities of the political parties;

14. Notes the Secretary-General's decision to explore the possibility of establishing a more effective mechanism for the provision of resources, disbursement under which is subject to the scrupulous and timely implementation of the General Peace Agreement, as described in paragraph 35 of his report of 28 January 1994;

15. Welcomes the proposal to extend the present severance payment scheme to facilitate the reintegration of demobilizing soldiers into civil society and encourages the international community to provide appropriate and prompt assistance for the implementation of this scheme as a complement to the existing efforts made in the framework of the humanitarian assistance programme;

16. Expresses its appreciation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, France, Portugal and Italy for their offers of assistance in military training or in rehabilitating the training centres for the new army;

17. Notes also with appreciation the response of the international community to the humanitarian assistance needs of Mozambique and encourages the international community to continue to provide appropriate and prompt assistance for the implementation of the humanitarian programme carried out in the framework of the General Peace Agreement;

18. Urges all parties to continue to facilitate unimpeded access to humanitarian assistance for the civilian population in need, and also to cooperate with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and

other humanitarian agencies operating in Mozambique to facilitate the speedy repatriation and resettlement of refugees and displaced persons;

19. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure maximum economy in the operations of ONUMOZ, while remaining mindful of the importance of an effective discharge of its mandate;

20. Looks forward to the next report of the Secretary-General called for in paragraph 13 of resolution 882 (1993) on whether the parties have made sufficient and tangible progress towards implementing the General Peace Agreement and in meeting the timetable set out in paragraphs 3 and 10 of that resolution, on the basis of which it will consider the mandate of ONUMOZ;

21. Decides to remain actively seized of the matter.



General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/48/874
S/1994/189
18 February 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-eighth session
Agenda item 8

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-ninth year

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA AND ORGANIZATION OF WORK

Letter dated 16 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of
Slovenia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith the text of opinions Nos. 8, 9 and 10 dated 4 July 1992 rendered by the Arbitration Commission of the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia concerning the dissolution and extinction of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

I should be grateful if you would have the text of this letter and its annex distributed as a document of the General Assembly, under item 8 of the agenda of the forty-eighth session, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Danilo TÜRK
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

Annex

ARBITRATION COMMISSION

Opinion No. 8

On 18 May 1992, the Chairman of the Arbitration Commission received a letter from Lord Carrington, Chairman of the Conference on Yugoslavia, putting three questions to the Commission, the text of which is reproduced in the interlocutory decision rendered today by the Arbitration Commission.

In the opinion of the Commission, the answers to questions Nos. 1 and 3 depend on the answer given to question No. 2. The Commission will therefore start by giving its opinion on question No. 2. Questions Nos. 1 and 3 will be dealt with in opinions Nos. 10 and 9 respectively.

Question No. 2 is as follows:

Question No. 2

"In its opinion No. 1 of 29 November 1991, the Arbitration Commission was of the opinion 'that the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia [was] in the process of dissolution'. Can this dissolution now be regarded as complete?"

The Commission has taken note of the memoranda, observations and documents transmitted by the Republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia.

In an interlocutory decision today, the Commission found that this matter was within its competence.

1. In its opinion No. 1 of 29 November 1991, the Arbitration Commission found that:

- A State's existence or non-existence had to be established on the basis of universally acknowledged principles of international law concerning the constituent elements of a State;

- The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was at that time still an international legal entity but the desire for independence had been expressed through referendums in the Republics of Slovenia, Croatia and Macedonia, and through a resolution on sovereignty in Bosnia and Herzegovina;

- The composition and functioning of essential bodies of the Federation no longer satisfied the intrinsic requirements of a federal State in respect of participation and representativeness;

- Recourse to force between different parts of the Federation had demonstrated the Federation's impotence;

- The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was in the process of dissolution but it was nevertheless up to the Republics which so wished to constitute, if appropriate, a new association with democratic institutions of their choice;

- The existence or extinction of a State was, in any case, a question of fact.

2. The dissolution of a State means that it no longer has legal personality, and this has major repercussions in international law. It therefore calls for the greatest prudence.

The Commission finds that the existence of a federal State, made up of a number of distinct federal entities, is seriously compromised when a majority of these entities, embracing a greater part of the territory and population of the Federation, constitute themselves as sovereign States, with the result that federal authority may no longer be effectively exercised in that territory.

By the same token, while recognition of a State by other States has only declarative value, such recognition, together with membership in international organizations, bears witness to these States' conviction that the political entity so recognized is a reality and confers upon it certain rights and obligations under international law.

3. The Arbitration Commission notes that, since issuing opinion No. 1:

- The referendum proposed in its opinion No. 4 was held in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 29 February and 1 March 1992, and a large majority of the population voted in favour of that Republic's independence;

- Serbia and Montenegro, as republics with equal standing in law, have constituted a new State with the name "Federal Republic of Yugoslavia", and on 27 April 1992 adopted a new Constitution;

- Most of the new States formed from the former Yugoslav republics have recognized each other's independence, thereby demonstrating that all the authority of the federal State had ended in the territories of the newly constituted States;

- The common federal bodies in which all the Yugoslav republics were represented no longer exist, and no body of that type has since functioned;

- The former national territory and population of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia are now entirely under the sovereign authority of the new States;

- Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slovenia have been recognized by all the States members of the European Community and by numerous other States, and were admitted to membership in the United Nations on 22 May 1992;

- United Nations Security Council resolutions 752 (1992) and 757 (1992) contain a number of references to "the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia";

- Moreover, resolution 757 (1992) notes that "the claim by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to continue automatically the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations has not been generally accepted";

- The declaration issued in Lisbon on 27 June 1992 by the European Council of Ministers makes express reference to "the former Yugoslavia".

4. The Arbitration Commission is therefore of the opinion:

- That the process of dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia referred to in opinion No. 1 of 29 November 1991 is now complete and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia no longer exists.

Paris, 4 July 1992

Opinion No. 9

On 18 May 1992, the Chairman of the Arbitration Commission received a letter from Lord Carrington, Chairman of the Conference on Yugoslavia, asking for the Commission's opinion on the following question:

"If this is the case (i.e., that the dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is now complete), on what basis and by what means should the problems of the succession of States arising between the different States emerging from the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia be settled?"

The Commission has taken note of the memoranda, observations and documents transmitted by the Republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia.

In an interlocutory decision today, the Commission found that this matter was within its competence.

1. As the Arbitration Commission found in opinion No. 8, the answer to this question very much depends on the answer to question No. 2 raised by the Chairman of the Conference.

In its opinion No. 8, the Arbitration Commission concluded that the process of dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was complete and that that State no longer existed.

New States have been created in the territory of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and have replaced it. All are successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

2. As the Arbitration Commission pointed out in its opinion No. 1, the succession of States is governed by the principles of international law embodied in the Vienna Conventions of 23 August 1978 and 8 April 1983, which all the republics have agreed should be the foundation for their discussions on the succession of States at the Conference on Yugoslavia.

The chief concern is that the solution adopted should lead to an equitable outcome, with the States concerned agreeing to the procedures, subject to respect for the guiding norms of general international law and, particularly, the fundamental rights of the individual and the rights of peoples and minorities.

3. In the declaration on the former Yugoslavia issued in Lisbon on 27 June 1992, the European Council of Ministers stated: "The European Economic Community and its member States will not recognize the new federal entity comprising Serbia and Montenegro as the successor State of the former Yugoslavia until the moment a decision has been taken by the qualified international institutions. They decided to demand the suspension of the Yugoslav delegation in the proceedings at the CSCE and other international forums and organizations". The European Council thereby demonstrated its conviction that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) had no right to

/...

consider itself the sole successor to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

4. The Arbitration Commission is therefore of the opinion that:

- The successor States to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia must together settle all aspects of the succession by agreement;
- In the resulting negotiations, the successor States must try to achieve an equitable solution by drawing on the principles embodied in the 1978 and 1983 Vienna Conventions and the relevant rules of customary international law;
- Furthermore, full account must be taken of the principle of equality of rights and duties between States under international law;
- The membership of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in international organizations must be terminated in accordance with their respective statutes, and none of the successor States may thereupon claim for itself alone the membership rights previously enjoyed by the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;
- Property of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia situated in third countries must be divided equally between the successor States;
- The assets and debts of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia must likewise be shared equitably among the successor States;
- The States concerned must settle any disputes relating to their succession to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia that could not be settled by agreement exclusively by peaceful means, in accordance with the principle laid down in the Charter of the United Nations;
- Specifically, they must seek a solution to such disputes by enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration or judicial settlement;
- Since, however, no specific question has been put to it, the Commission cannot at this stage venture an opinion on the difficulties that might arise from the very real problems associated with the succession to the former Yugoslavia.

Paris, 4 July 1992

Opinion No. 10

On 18 May 1992, the Chairman of the Arbitration Commission received a letter from Lord Carrington, Chairman of the Conference for Peace in Yugoslavia, asking for the Commission's opinion on the following question:

"In terms of international law, is the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia a new State, and thus subject to recognition by the States members of the European Community in accordance with the Declaration on Yugoslavia and the guidelines on the recognition of new States in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union issued by the Council of Ministers of the European Community on 16 December 1991?"

The Commission has taken note of the memoranda, observations and documents transmitted by the Republics of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Slovenia.

In an interlocutory decision today, the Commission found that this matter was within its competence.

1. As the Arbitration Commission found in opinion No. 8, the answer to this question depends on the answer given to question No. 2 raised by the Chairman of the Conference.

In its opinion No. 8, the Commission concluded that the process of dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was complete and that none of the resulting entities could claim to be the sole successor to that State.

2. On 27 April 1992, Montenegro and Serbia decided to establish a new entity with the name "Federal Republic of Yugoslavia" and adopted its Constitution.

The Arbitration Commission feels that, within the frontiers constituted by the administrative boundaries of Montenegro and Serbia within the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, this new entity meets the criteria of public international law for a State, which were listed in opinion No. 1 of 29 November 1991. However, as the United Nations Security Council pointed out in its resolution 757 (1992) "the claim by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to continue automatically the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations has not been generally accepted". As the Arbitration Commission points out in its opinion No. 9, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia is a new State which could not be the sole successor to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

3. This means that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) does not ipso facto enjoy the recognition that was enjoyed, under completely different circumstances, by the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. It therefore rests with other States, where appropriate, to recognize the new State.

4. As, however, the Arbitration Commission pointed out in its opinion No. 1, while recognition is not a prerequisite for the foundation of a State and has

/...

only declarative value, it is none the less a discretionary act which other States may perform when they choose and in a manner of their own choosing, subject only to respect for the guiding norms of general international law, particularly those which prohibit the use of force in relations with other States or those which guarantee the rights of ethnic, religious or linguistic minorities.

Furthermore, the Community and its member States, in their Declaration on Yugoslavia of 16 December 1991 and in the guidelines, adopted by them on the same date, on the recognition of new States in Eastern Europe and in the Soviet Union, set out the conditions for recognition of the Yugoslav republics.

5. Consequently, the Arbitration Commission is of the opinion that:

- The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is a new State which cannot be considered the sole successor to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia;

- Recognition of that State by the States members of the European Community would be subject to its compliance with the conditions laid down for such an act by general international law and by the Declaration and guidelines of 16 December 1991.

Paris, 4 July 1992



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/190
17 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 17 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I should like to refer to my letter dated 1 February 1994 (S/1994/109) and your statement dated 3 February 1994 (S/PRST/6) regarding the presence of Croatian Army units in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In the statement of 3 February 1994, the Security Council requested that I monitor closely the situation and report to the Council within two weeks on progress towards the complete and full withdrawal of all elements of the Croatian Army (HV) as well as military equipment from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

As mentioned in my letter dated 1 February 1994, the ability of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) to observe developments throughout Bosnia and Herzegovina is limited. UNPROFOR is, therefore, not in a position to verify in a systematic fashion whether all elements of the Croatian Army and the equipment concerned are being withdrawn. The following observations of UNPROFOR should be seen in this context.

On 10 February, UNPROFOR observed a convoy of the Croatian Defence Council (HVO), consisting of 21 trucks and other equipment, leaving the territory of Bosnia and Herzegovina via the Lipa checkpoint. One of these trucks had markings of the Fifth HV Brigade. The convoy also included a bus carrying 36 soldiers with insignia of an independent Croatian Army unit from Zagreb. The event was videotaped by a uniformed cameraman of the HV or HVO.

In a letter dated 11 February 1994 addressed to me, the Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister of Croatia, Dr. Mate Granic, stated, inter alia, that the Republic would approach my Special Representative for the former Yugoslavia, Mr. Yasushi Akashi, to agree on a monitoring mechanism which would verify strict compliance with the Security Council's request.

In a letter dated 15 February 1994 addressed to my Special Representative and the Force Commander of UNPROFOR, the Head of the Office for the United Nations and the European Union of the Croatian Foreign Ministry, Mr. Budimir Plestina, stated, inter alia, that on 16 February Croatian Army elements would leave the front line of the wider region of the river Neretva.

The departure of these elements would commence at 1000 hours and be accomplished by 1700 hours of the same day in the region of Metkovic.

As of 17 February, UNPROFOR has not yet received any concrete proposals for a monitoring arrangement nor have any of the troop movements indicated in the above letter been observed.

In the absence of any observations of HV withdrawal movements beyond that on 10 February, UNPROFOR continues to assess that there still may be 5,000 HV troops in Bosnia and Herzegovina, although no HV command posts nor any full HV brigades operating as formed units have been identified.

It appears that HV troops are now being more circumspect and may be removing their HV insignia while in Bosnia and Herzegovina and replacing them with those of the HVO. UNPROFOR believes that HV insignia on a number of vehicles have been erased or repainted.

UNPROFOR will continue to monitor developments to the extent possible.

(Signed) Boutros BOUTROS-GHALI



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/191
17 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 17 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On the instructions of my Government I have the honour to relate to you the following information to the Security Council.

After almost two weeks since the United Nations Security Council has demanded that Croatian troops be withdrawn from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina, it is our Government's information that this withdrawal has not been accomplished.

We await the requested report of the Secretary-General regarding UNPROFOR's most recent information with respect to the mandated withdrawal.

May I ask, Excellency, for your kind assistance in circulating this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Muhamed SACIRBEY



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/192
17 February 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: RUSSIAN

LETTER DATED 17 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO
THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to transmit herewith a statement of 17 February 1994 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation regarding the lifting of the siege of Sarajevo (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Y. VORONTSOV

Annex

Statement of 17 February 1994 by the Ministry of
Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation

In the last few days Russia has undertaken additional efforts with a view to the implementation of the proposal it put forward at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly regarding the lifting of the siege of Sarajevo and the transfer of this city to United Nations control. The implementation of this proposal is the goal we have been and are working towards, acting openly and within the framework of Security Council resolutions. We continue to follow the same line even now, despite the serious aggravation of the situation regarding Sarajevo, the causes of which are known.

As a result of the steps taken by the Russian leadership and some intense diplomatic activity, this sustained and consistent line, which excludes unilateral ultimatums, has borne fruit.

In response to our appeal, the Bosnian Serbs took the decision at their Assembly in Pale to withdraw their heavy weaponry from the area of Sarajevo.

We believe that this manifestation of good will of one of the parties to the conflict at a moment which is critical to the settlement will elicit similar moves by the other party.

We urge the Bosnian Government to place without delay all its heavy weapons in and around Sarajevo under UNPROFOR's control in accordance with the Secretary-General's plan set out in his letter to the Security Council of 10 February.

We also urge our partners in the effort to secure a settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and first of all the United States of America and the countries of the European Community, that, in the spirit of their statements about the preferability of a political settlement, they prevail on the Bosnian Government to cooperate with the United Nations in the full lifting of the siege of Sarajevo and the demilitarization of Sarajevo.

At the present crucial moment, it is extremely important to prevent any acts of provocation or sabotage against this peace process. Not only the fate of Sarajevo but also that of the settlement in Bosnia and Herzegovina in general depend on it.

After the lifting of the siege of Sarajevo, the Security Council could, as we proposed at an earlier time, immediately start to consider ways to establish the United Nations administration in that city and measures to strengthen other safe areas in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

In order to step up its own contribution to the turn towards peace, Russia is ready to send a part of its military contingent currently in the United Nations Force to ensure control over the implementation of agreements on lifting the siege of Sarajevo.



General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/77
S/1994/193
18 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Item 72 of the preliminary list*
MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-ninth year

Letter dated 14 February 1994 from the representatives of
Cambodia and Thailand to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

We have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency the text of the joint communiqué between H.E. Mr. Chuan Leekpai, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Thailand, and His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Ranariddh and His Excellency Mr. Hun Sen, First and Second Prime Ministers of the Kingdom of Cambodia, dated 13 January 1994. The joint communiqué was issued during the official visit of the Prime Minister of Thailand to the Kingdom of Cambodia from 12 to 14 January 1994.

We should be grateful if you would have this letter and its enclosure circulated as a document of the General Assembly, under item 72 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Thakur PHANIT
Deputy Permanent Representative
of Thailand to the United Nations
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

(Signed) HRH Prince SISOWATH Sirirath
Permanent Representative
of Cambodia to the
United Nations

* A/49/50.

Annex

Joint communiqué by the Prime Minister of Thailand and the
First and Second Prime Ministers of Cambodia, issued at
Phnom Penh on 13 January 1994

1. At the invitation of His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Ranariddh and His Excellency Mr. Hun Sen, First and Second Prime Ministers of the Royal Government of Cambodia, respectively, His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai, Prime Minister of the Kingdom of Thailand, paid an official visit, the first ever by a Thai Prime Minister, to the Kingdom of Cambodia from 12 to 14 January 1994.
2. During his stay in Cambodia, His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai met with Samdech Chea Sim, President of the National Assembly and Head of State ad interim. At the meeting, Samdech Chea Sim and His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai noted the positive developments in the situation in South-east Asia and shared the views that the present situation is developing towards peace, stability and cooperation among the countries in the region. Samdech Chea Sim and His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai exchanged views on the present state of relationship between the Kingdom of Cambodia and the Kingdom of Thailand and expressed satisfaction at the continuing close ties of friendship and mutual cooperation between the two countries. His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai conveyed, through Samdech Chea Sim, the best wishes of His Majesty King Bhumibol Adulyadej and the people of Thailand to His Majesty Preah Bat Samdech Preah Norodom Sihanouk Varman, King of Cambodia, for His Majesty's good health, longevity and happiness.
3. During the visit, His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai and his ~~delegation~~ placed a wreath at the Monument of Independence and visited several places of cultural and historical significance in Phnom Penh and Siem Reap. His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai, His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Ranariddh and His Excellency Mr. Hun Sen presided over the opening ceremony of Highway Route 5 between Poipet-Sisophon which was repaired and restored by the Thai Government. His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai, His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Ranariddh and His Excellency Mr. Hun Sen also witnessed the opening ceremony of the Friendship Bridge at Khlongluek-Poipet which was funded by the United Kingdom Government and constructed by the Thai Government.
4. An official meeting between the delegation of the Royal Thai Government, led by His Excellency Mr. Chuan Leekpai, and the delegation of the Royal Government of Cambodia, led by His Royal Highness Prince Norodom Ranariddh and His Excellency Mr. Hun Sen, took place on 12 January 1994 at the Prime Ministers's Office. The meeting took place in an atmosphere of friendship, mutual understanding and cooperation.
5. The Cambodian side welcomed the first official visit by the Prime Minister of Thailand to Cambodia and noted its significance as it opened a new era of relationship between the two countries. The Thai side expressed its appreciation for the warm reception and excellent hospitality accorded by the Cambodian side.

6. The Thai side congratulated His Majesty Preah Bat Samdech Preah Norodom Sihanouk Varman on His Majesty's ascension to the throne and praised the leadership role of His Majesty in contributing to the advancement of peace and national reconciliation in Cambodia.
7. The two sides noted that the end of the cold war has ushered in an atmosphere of increasing understanding among nations in South-East Asia. The remarkable economic development throughout the region has made South-East Asia one of the world's most dynamic regions for development. Both sides agreed that the opportunity for further forging of economic linkages and interdependence among the countries in the region should not be lost as it will contribute to increasing stability and prosperity in the region.
8. The Thai side welcomed and strongly supported the establishment of the new democratic Cambodian Government and expressed confidence that the latter will attain lasting peace and prosperity in Cambodia. The Thai side praised the continuing efforts of the Cambodian Government aimed at bringing about genuine national reconciliation which is in accordance with His Majesty Preah Bat Samdech Preah Norodom Sihanouk Varman's guidance.
9. The Cambodian side expressed its deep appreciation to the people of Thailand for their firm and continuing support for the peace process in Cambodia and for Thailand's constructive role in the successful implementation of the Paris peace accords.
10. The Thai side welcomed the return of Cambodia to the international community as an independent and democratic country and reiterated its firm intention to support the rehabilitation and reconstruction of Cambodia so that Cambodia will prosper alongside other countries in the region. The Thai side informed the Cambodian side that, for the fiscal year 1993-1994, the Royal Thai Government has allocated a budget of 30 million baht to assist Cambodia, especially in areas of human resource development and technical assistance in various fields such as in public health, agriculture, vocational training, education, banking, civil aviation, science and technology. The Cambodian side sincerely thanked the Thai side for providing such assistance.
11. Both sides expressed satisfaction at the present state of relationship between the two countries and reaffirmed their determination to constantly and concretely strengthen bilateral ties on the basis of mutual benefit and respect for the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of each other.
12. In order to promote trade and investment, the Cambodian side reaffirmed its policy to honour legitimate contracts previously entered upon by Thai businessmen and the Cambodian parties and by Cambodian businessmen and the Thai parties. In case of unclear business contracts, the Cambodian side informed that it will review such contracts in a just and non-discriminatory manner and, pending changes to be made in the contracts, consult the concerned Thai businessmen with a view to ensuring fairness and mutual benefits for all parties. In response to the request from the Cambodian side, the Thai side agreed that the importation of soybeans from Cambodia could be effected in the quantity of 10,000 tons by July 1994.

13. Both sides exchanged views on the prospects for strengthening bilateral cooperation and agreed that potentials for greater cooperation exist in the fields of fishery, offshore joint development and tourism. The criminal and illegal activities by armed individuals and groups on and along the Thai-Cambodian border, affecting the security of both countries, should be looked at seriously. To this end, an agreement on the establishment of a joint commission for bilateral cooperation between Thailand and Cambodia was signed by the Foreign Ministers of the two countries. Both sides also agreed to establish the Thai-Cambodian joint committee on boundary in due course.

14. Both sides agreed in principle that the State visit to be made by His Majesty Preah Bat Samdech Preah Norodom Sihanouk Varman to the Kingdom of Thailand would further strengthen the already close and happily existing bonds of relations between Thailand and Cambodia. The mutually agreeable dates would be communicated through diplomatic channels.

15. The two sides welcomed the successful outcome of the visit to the Kingdom of Cambodia by the Prime Minister of Thailand, which represented an important milestone in the history of the good-neighbourly relations between the two countries. The two sides also welcomed the frequent exchange of visits by leaders of the two countries as it served to promote and strengthen bilateral relations and shared the view that there should be more such visits in the future.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/194
18 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 17 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF
MACEDONIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE
PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to transmit, enclosed herewith, the statement by the Government of the Republic of Macedonia dated 16 February 1994, concerning the unilateral measures that the Republic of Greece undertook against the Republic of Macedonia.

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter and its annex circulated as a document of the Security Council, in connection with resolution 845 (1993) of the Council.

(Signed) Denko MALESKI
Ambassador Extraordinary
and Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative
to the United Nations

Annex

Statement

With regard to the decision of the Government of the Republic of Greece of 16 February 1994, the Government of the Republic of Macedonia issued the following:

The Government of the Republic of Macedonia considers that the recent decision of the Government of the Republic of Greece to stop the work of the Consulate General of the Republic of Greece in Skopje and to cease the transportation of goods from and to Skopje from Salonika Port actually represents imposition of an embargo against our country and is an act violating the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations, CSCE documents and international law. This act of the Greek side does not respect the conclusion of the Presidency of the European Council, Edinburgh, 11-12 December 1993, which underlines the importance of the regular supply of oil to our country. Such unilateral and unacceptable measures of the Greek Government especially disturb us because they are contradictory to the United Nations Security Council resolution which urges Macedonia and Greece, in the framework of the United Nations, to settle the differences through negotiations and in that way contribute to strengthening peace and stability in the region.

The Republic of Macedonia has had and still has a peaceful position regarding every event in the territory of former Yugoslavia, it is not involved in the war and did everything in its power to build a democratic society and market economy, as well as to regulate inter-ethnic relations through dialogue and tolerance. In the dispute with Greece it has manifested the highest flexibility and intention to solve unsettled issues in good faith. The entire world is aware of this attitude of Macedonia. Macedonia has succeeded in preserving peace and stability in the country thus becoming a factor of peace and stability in the region.

Hence the astonishing fact is that at the same time when the international community makes enormous efforts aimed at peaceful and negotiable settlement of the most complex problems, including the cessation of the war in Bosnia, the Republic of Greece, Member of the United Nations, CSCE, NATO, Council of Europe and currently holding the Presidency of the European Union, takes such measures against our independent and peaceful country. The Greek Government intends to use them for exerting economic, political and other kinds of pressure on our country, taking advantage of our position of a land-locked country.

The Government of the Republic of Macedonia wishes to emphasize that this causes immense damage to the long-lasting interests of the two countries and peoples, as well as to the future of mutual relations and cooperation for which the Greek side is responsible. On the other hand, Macedonia remains firmly committed to friendly relations with all neighbours, including its southern neighbour, and is prepared to continue the Macedonian-Greek dialogue.

The Government of the Republic of Macedonia will with great attention consider all likely consequences of the Greek blockade which was by no means caused by the Macedonian side and, in that respect, it will take necessary measures and activities at the international level.

Skopje, 16 February 1994

Government of the Republic
of Macedonia



General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/78
S/1994/195
18 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Item 72 of the preliminary list*
MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL
SECURITY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-ninth year

Letter dated 18 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative
of the Republic of Moldova to the United Nations addressed to
the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit to you herewith the statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Moldova regarding the statement made by the Russian 14th Army Military Council on 8 February 1994 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of the present letter and its annex circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under item 72 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Tudor PANTIRU
Ambassador Extraordinary and
Plenipotentiary
Permanent Representative
of the Republic of Moldova to the
United Nations

* A/49/50.

ANNEX

Statement issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Republic of Moldova on 10 February 1994

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Moldova expresses its profound concern and indignation over the statement made by the Russian 14th Army Military Council on 8 February 1994.

Having assumed, in an abusive mode, responsibilities with which it was not invested, the 14th Army of the Russian Federation resorts to a provocative tone by threatening the Republic of Moldova with application of force if the conditions imposed by the 14th Army are not met.

The intonation of a mentor in which the aforementioned statement was adopted denotes the fact that the 14th Army does not want to acknowledge an undeniable truth that it is a foreign army deployed on the territory of a sovereign and independent State, which does not accept being spoken to in a manner of dictation and blackmail.

Our concern increases, given the fact that it is likely that this document was inspired and coordinated by the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation before being issued.

The leadership of the Republic of Moldova has always stood for the settlement of the dispute in the eastern regions of Moldova by peaceful and political means. However, the illegitimate authorities of Tiraspol block any initiative and constructive proposals put forward by Chisinau by promoting a secessionist and, in fact, a failed policy, which brought the population of the left bank of the Dniester river to a state of total disaster and despair. Excessive militarization of the eastern regions of the Republic, persecution of those who share different views, restrictions on travelling and prohibition of participation in the elections to the Parliament of the Republic of Moldova leave no doubt as to who is the instigator and where the true hotbed of potential conflict or armed provocation is.

By the aforementioned statement of the Military Council, the 14th Army of the Russian Federation once again demonstrates that it constitutes the main destabilizing factor in the region, and its actions cannot be regarded other than a flagrant violation of the Moldovan-Russian Convention of 21 July 1992 on the settlement of the armed conflict in the eastern regions of the Republic. In this connection, the statement by the 14th Army Military Council is meant to wreck the negotiations on an early, complete and unconditional withdrawal of the 14th Army, for which the Moldovan Government stands.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Moldova considers the statement by the Russian 14th Army Military Council a direct, impertinent interference in the internal affairs of our country, which constitutes a brutal violation of a fundamental principle of international law.



General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/79
S/1994/196
18 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Item 39 of the preliminary list*
THE SITUATION IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-ninth year

Letter dated 18 February 1994 from the Chargé d'affaires a.i.
of the Permanent Mission of Ukraine to the United Nations
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to transmit herewith the statement issued on
18 February 1994 by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine on the situation
in Bosnia and Herzegovina (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of the present letter and
its annex circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under
item 39 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) Volodymyr D. KHANDOGY
Chargé d'affaires a.i.
Permanent Mission of Ukraine
to the United Nations

* A/49/50.

Annex

Statement issued on 18 February 1994 by the Ministry of Foreign
Affairs of Ukraine on the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina

The developments in Bosnia and Herzegovina are followed with great attention in Ukraine.

According to the latest reports from Sarajevo, after reaching a cease-fire agreement between the Bosnian Serbs and Muslims via mediation of the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) Command, both sides have started withdrawal of heavy artillery and its placement under United Nations control.

Ukraine welcomes these positive developments and calls on all parties engaged in this conflict to continue their efforts, the ultimate goal of which must be an agreement on placement of all weapons under United Nations control, complete withdrawal of Serb units from Sarajevo and taking over their positions by the peace-keeping forces. The demilitarization of Sarajevo and placement of the city under United Nations control would put an end to senseless bloodshed and serve as a starting-point for reaching a fair, peaceful settlement.

Ukraine believes that the refusal of any of the sides to the conflict to cooperate further with the United Nations in fulfilling the agreements reached should be considered as a challenge to the international community, disregard of United Nations decisions and a situation that might lead to the use of force as stipulated under the Charter of the United Nations and Security Council resolutions 836 (1993) of 4 June 1993 and 844 (1993) of 18 June 1993.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Ukraine strongly appeals to the political leadership of the conflicting parties, the peoples of Bosnia and Herzegovina, to demonstrate political wisdom and put aside all insults, reproaches and mistrust, in order to opt once and for all in favour of peace in the region.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/197
18 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 17 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF
CROATIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to inform you about the progress regarding the action of the Republic of Croatia undertaken in compliance with the statement by the President of the Security Council issued 3 February 1994 (S/PRST/1994/6).

Croatian volunteers that had been situated in the Uskoplje-Rama area in Central Bosnia have returned to the Republic of Croatia on 10 February 1994. The convoy consisting of 44 vehicles with 12 heavy artillery weapons, 3 buses and 650 volunteers crossed the Kamensko border-pass at 1700 hours and proceeded towards Split.

On 16 February at 1000 hours elements of the Croatian Army left the wider Neretva river region and have been repositioned in the Metkovic area on the territory of the Republic of Croatia. I have received information from my authorities that amongst the aforesaid elements of the Croatian Army were 600 soldiers, 4 battle tanks and 6 heavy artillery pieces.

The Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Croatia has already informed UNPROFOR Force Commander, General Jean Cot, and your special representative, Mr. Yasushi Akashi about the above-mentioned data. The Chief-of-Staff of the Croatian Army, General Gunk Bobetko, has also personally informed the Spanish UNPROFOR battalion operating in the area of this matter.

My Government finds it necessary to reiterate its position emphasized in the letter addressed to you by the Foreign Minister of Croatia, dated 11 February 1994 (S/1994/177). It is of the utmost importance that all military activities against Bosnian Croat enclaves in Central Bosnia stop immediately, and that the population in those enclaves start receiving humanitarian and medical aid. Therefore Croatia calls upon the Security Council to act in this regard by establishing efficient guarantees and mechanisms for supporting the security and stability of Central Bosnia.

The Republic of Croatia welcomes the peace initiative aimed at strengthening relations between Bosnian Croats and Bosnian Muslims, as well as between the Republic of Croatia and the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina. This process will have a significant influence upon the progress of complying

S/1994/197

English

Page 2

with the Security Council statement of 3 February 1994. Croatia is ready for additional steps and continued negotiations with the view of defining lasting relations with the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina which will benefit the stability in the region.

I would appreciate if you could provide for the circulation of this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mario NOBILO
Ambassador
Permanent Representative



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/198
19 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 16 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF CROATIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I should like to draw the attention of Your Excellency, as the depositary of international conventions, to the letter dated 27 April 1992 addressed to the President of the Security Council and the letter of 6 May 1992 addressed to Your Excellency by the Chargé d'affaires a.i. of the Permanent Mission of Yugoslavia to the United Nations (S/23877 and A/46/915). The Republic of Croatia became a Member of the United Nations on 22 May 1992, i.e., after the circulation of these documents. Therefore, the Republic of Croatia at that time did not make any official statement concerning the aforementioned documents.

These documents contain the declaration adopted on 27 April 1992 at the joint session of the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia and the Assembly of the Republic of Montenegro on the establishment of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as well as the statement of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia relating to this declaration.

The first sentence of paragraph 1 of the above-mentioned declaration proclaims that "the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, continuing the state, international legal and political personality of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, shall strictly abide by all the commitments that the SFR of Yugoslavia assumed internationally". The letter addressed to you contained the following statement: "Strictly respecting the continuity of the international personality of Yugoslavia, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia shall continue to fulfil all the rights conferred to, and obligations assumed by, the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in international relations, including its membership in all international organizations and participation in international treaties ratified or acceded to by Yugoslavia".

The Republic of Croatia strongly objects to the pretention of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to continue the state, international, legal and political personality of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

In this connection, the Republic of Croatia wants to emphasize that the relevant resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly concerning this issue did not accept this claim of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

(Serbia and Montenegro). The Security Council, in its resolution 757 (1992), particularly notes that "the claim by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to continue automatically the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations has not been generally accepted". This position was reaffirmed in Security Council resolution 777 (1992), which further notes "that the State formerly known as the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has ceased to exist" and "that the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) cannot continue automatically the membership of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in the United Nations". On 22 September 1992, the General Assembly, in its resolution 47/1, agreed with the Security Council recommendation.

I should also like to draw your attention to the opinions of the Arbitration Commission of the United Nations/European Community International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, particularly opinions Nos. 8, 9 and 10 of 4 July 1992 (see S/1994/189, annex). The Commission has concluded that "the process of dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia ... is now complete and the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia no longer exists" (opinion No. 8), and that "the successor States to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia must together settle all aspects of the succession by agreement ... and that none of the successor States may thereupon claim for itself alone the membership rights previously enjoyed by the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia" (opinion No. 9). Furthermore, according to opinion No. 10 of the Commission, since there was no agreement among the successor States of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as to the succession of the rights and obligations of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, general rules of international law which deal with succession of States with respect to treaties, property, archives and debts should be applied. In connection with this issue, the Commission considers that "the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is a new State which cannot be considered the sole successor to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia".

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) has, however, not acted according to rules of international law and the aforementioned resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Moreover, it has ignored them and tried to participate in international forums as a State party to treaties and/or as a member of international organizations with the intention to create a precedent by which it would later seek to prove that it is the sole legitimate successor to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (regardless of its name) is one of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and has equal rights and obligations, no more or less than any other legal successors (Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia and Slovenia) to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In its opinion No. 11 of 16 July 1992, the Arbitration Commission established the dates of succession of States for five successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In regard to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), it came to the conclusion "that 27 April 1992 must be considered the date of State succession in respect of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia because that was the date on which Montenegro and Serbia adopted the Constitution of the new entity and because the relevant international agencies

then begin to refer to 'the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia', affirming that the process of dissolution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia has been completed".

In accordance with this, if the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) expressed its intention to be considered, in respect of its territory, a party, by virtue of succession to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to treaties of the predecessor State, with effect from 27 April 1992, the date on which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), as a new State, assumed responsibility for its international relations, the Republic of Croatia would fully respect that notification of succession.

I would kindly request your assistance in circulating this letter as a document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Mario NOBILO
Permanent Representative



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/199
18 February 1994,

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL CONCERNING THE CREDENTIALS OF
THE ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF CHINA ON THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Pursuant to rule 15 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, the Secretary-General wishes to report that he has received a letter, dated 17 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stating that Mr. He Yafei has been appointed alternate representative of China on the Security Council.

In the opinion of the Secretary-General, this letter constitutes adequate provisional credentials.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/200
19 February 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: FRENCH

NOTE VERBALE DATED 9 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT
REPRESENTATIVE OF BELGIUM TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to Security Council resolution 883 (1993) concerning the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

In accordance with paragraph 13 of that resolution, he has the honour to transmit to the Secretary-General the following information which has been communicated to him by the competent Belgian authorities:

Belgium applies European Union Regulation* CE/3274/93 of 29 November 1993 preventing the supply of certain goods and services to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and European Union Regulation* CE/3275/93 of 29 November 1993 prohibiting the satisfaction of claims with regard to contracts and transactions the performance of which was affected by Security Council resolution 883 (1993) and related resolutions.

This community legislation is supplemented by a ministerial order which requires a licence for the export and transit of certain goods for consignment to the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, and by a royal order concerning financial relations with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya.

The texts of these documents are annexed to the present note.

Pending their publication in the Moniteur Belge (the official gazette of Belgian laws and orders), these orders remain unnumbered.

* The text of these regulations may be consulted in room S-3545.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/201
19 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

NOTE VERBALE DATED 15 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT
MISSION OF ETHIOPIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO
THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

The Permanent Mission of Ethiopia to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General and, pursuant to paragraph 13 of Security Council resolution 883 (1993), has the honour to inform the latter that the Transitional Government of Ethiopia has taken all necessary measures to meet the obligation set out in paragraphs 3 to 7 of the aforementioned resolution. All competent authorities have been duly instructed to comply fully with the above-mentioned paragraphs of the resolution.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/202
20 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 20 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO
THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to request to convene an emergency meeting of the Security Council on the question of the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in connection with the recent developments in and around Sarajevo.

'Signed) Yuliy M. VORONTSOV



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/203
22 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 20 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

I have the honour to refer to the situation in Haiti on which I last reported to the Security Council in my report of 19 January 1994 (S/1994/54).

My Special Representative, Mr. Dante Caputo, has reported to me on 18 February and today that the situation in Haiti has seriously deteriorated in the last few months since obstacles arose to the implementation of the Governors Island Agreement. The people of Haiti are under severe strain, notwithstanding efforts to maintain the flow of humanitarian assistance. While I am not in a position to present a comprehensive and thorough report, it is clear that the human rights situation has also suffered a serious degradation.

A nucleus of the joint United Nations-Organization of American States human rights monitoring mission (MICIVIH) has remained in Port-au-Prince ever since the evacuation of the bulk of its personnel in October. Recently a small number of human rights observers returned to Haiti from the Dominican Republic in the hope that they could resume their tasks. Notwithstanding their efforts, this has proved possible only to a limited extent and almost entirely in the capital, Port-au-Prince. Without progress towards a political settlement of the crisis through implementation of the Governors Island Agreement it will be difficult for me to recommend that MICIVIH should be indefinitely maintained in Haiti.

There is thus an urgent need to break the current impasse. To this end, my Special Representative has continued to work intensively with the Four Friends of the Secretary-General for Haiti, in full consultation with the Secretary-General of the Organization of American States, to promote agreement between the parties on steps which would make it possible to resume implementation of the Governors Island Agreement.

An important step forward occurred on 14-16 January 1994, when President Aristide convened a conference in Miami, Florida in the framework of efforts to implement the Governors Island Agreement. At that conference a consensus emerged on a sequence of steps to be taken to break the current impasse and this consensus received the endorsement of President Aristide.

In recent days further consultations have taken place in Washington between leading members of both Houses of the Haitian Parliament, representing all political tendencies in that Parliament. On 19 January 1994 I received a letter from a representative group of those Parliamentarians informing me of the conclusions they had reached. The text of that letter is annexed.

I believe that these are significant developments. As a result of the Miami conference and the Washington consultations it is now possible to say that agreement has been reached between the elected supporters and opponents of President Aristide on a plan, which will make it possible to achieve the urgently needed objective of breaking the present impasse and resuming progress in implementing the Governors Island Agreement. I therefore commend the enclosed letter to the attention of the Security Council.

I should be grateful if you would convey this information to the members of the Security Council.

(Signed) Boutros BOUTROS-GHALI

Annex

[Original: French]

Letter dated 19 February 1994 from a delegation of Haitian
Parliamentarians addressed to the Secretary-General

The delegation of Haitian Parliamentarians invited to Washington by the Centre for Democracy presents its compliments to you for the concern shown regarding a solution to the crisis in our country and, with reference to the various meetings with representatives of the international community, is happy to be able to associate your good offices with its patriotic initiatives to find a way out of the impasse.

After 29 months, especially during the last four months, the Haitian people has been in despair because of the political and institutional crises and the embargo. Accordingly, the Haitian Parliament, which represents the will of the people and the co-guardian of national sovereignty, feels obliged to show leadership in finding an equitable solution which will preserve the dignity and ensure the survival of our country.

Since no State can live in isolation, and because the Haitian nation is experiencing difficulties, the delegation has decided to make a proposal designed to show the way out of the impasse. This proposal is based on the Governors Island Agreement, the New York Pact and the resolution of Workshop A of the Miami International Conference, held from 14 to 16 January 1994, which was convened by the President of the Republic and benefited from his assistance and from a high level of attention on the part of the international community. Article 6 of the resolution:

1. Recommends that the President of the Republic initiate the procedure for appointing a new Prime Minister and forming a Government of national concord;

2. Recommends that the President of the Republic obtain the lifting of the embargo once the following events have taken place:

(a) The commencement of the early retirement of General Cédras with the guarantees contained in the amnesty decree granted by the President;

(b) The confirmation of a new Prime Minister;

(c) The installation of the new Government of concord;

(d) The return of a climate of security and respect for human rights.

As responsible Parliamentarians, we assure you that we shall be entirely ready to take all necessary steps with regard to the voting on such essential legislation as that relating to the amnesty, the establishment of a police force and international cooperation in the military, technical and economic areas. We

/...

shall also be prepared to ensure the confirmation of the future Prime Minister under article 137 of the Haitian Constitution.

We submit to you for your scrutiny this plan for finding a way out of the impasse, and we remain persuaded that you will not fail to act on our request by granting it top priority and all the moral support of your institution.

We enclose a copy of the Miami Workshop A resolution, which has met with the approval of a number of political personalities of Haitian nationality including the President of the Senate, Jean-Louis Firmin, Senator Luc Fleurinor and the Secretary-General of KONAKOM, Victor Benoit.

This proposal by our delegation of Parliamentarians is intended as an effective and realistic means of dealing with the current impasse with a view to a prompt resolution of the Haitian crisis. Its main goal is to establish favourable conditions which will permit a full return to the constitutional order.

We remain at your disposition for any meeting that may be necessary to inform you of the modalities of implementation, given the various sectors involved in the crisis.

(Signed) Frantz Robert Mondé
President of the Chamber
of Deputies

(Signed) Yvon Ghislain
Senator
Secretary to the Senate
of the Republic

(Signed) Jean Eddy Talandier Desjardins
Deputy/MKN-Alliance

(Signed) Rindal Pierre Canel
Deputy/FNCD

(Signed) Duly Brutus
Deputy
President of the Group
Socialiste Démocratique

(Signed) Edmond Mirolde
Deputy/FNCD

Appendix

INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE HELD AT MIAMI FROM 14 TO 16 JANUARY 1994

RESOLUTIONS OF WORKSHOP A

1. The Miami International Conference affirms its support for the physical return to Haiti of the President of the Republic, Mr. Jean-Bertrand Aristide, to discharge his constitutional mandate.
2. The Miami Conference affirms its commitment to the Governors Island Agreement and the New York Pact, which, in the present situation, represent the most appropriate framework of reference for a peaceful outcome to the crisis.
3. The Conference recommends to the parliamentary groups and political forces which signed the New York Pact a uniting of their efforts with a view to the effective implementation of the Governors Island Agreement and the New York Pact.
4. The Conference requests the international community to continue to support the efforts of the President of the Republic and the Haitian democratic forces with a view to the restoration of the constitutional order. Accordingly, it seeks from the international community the implementation of the guarantees given on Governors Island, including the application of paragraph 5 of the Agreement.
5. The Miami International Conference supports the decision by President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to honour the request submitted by General Cédras for early retirement.
6. The Miami Conference recommends that the President of the Republic initiate the procedure for appointing a new Prime Minister and forming a Government of concord. With a view to reaching a prompt solution to the crisis, the Conference also recommends that the President of the Republic obtain from the international community the lifting of the embargo once the following events have taken place:
 - (a) The commencement of the early retirement of General Cédras with the guarantees contained in the amnesty decree granted by the President.
 - (b) The confirmation of the new Prime Minister.
 - (c) The installation of the Government of concord.
 - (d) The return of a climate of security and respect for human rights.
7. The Conference recommends the convening of a national conference after the return to Haiti of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide to discharge his functions.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/203/Corr.1
24 February 1994
ENGLISH
ORIGINAL: ENGLISH/FRENCH

LETTER DATED 20 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL
TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

Corrigendum

Annex

Replace the signature block by the following:

(Signed) Frantz Robert MONDÉ
President of the Chamber
of Deputies

(Signed) Yvons GHISLAIN
Senator
Secretary to the Senate
of the Republic

(Signed) Jean Eddy Talandier DESJARDINS
Deputy/MKN-Alliance

(Signed) Rindal Pierre CANEL
Deputy/FNCD

(Signed) Duly BRUTUS
Deputy
President of the Group
Socialiste démocratique

(Signed) Edmond MIROLD
Deputy/FNCD

(Signed) Antoine JOSEPH
Deputy, former President
of the Chamber of Deputies

(Signed) Julio LAROSILIÈRE
Senator
Questor of the Senate



General Assembly
Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

A/49/80
S/1994/204
23 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

GENERAL ASSEMBLY
Forty-ninth session
Items 64 and 65 of the preliminary list*
GENERAL AND COMPLETE DISARMAMENT
REVIEW AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
CONCLUDING DOCUMENT OF THE
TWELFTH SPECIAL SESSION OF THE
GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SECURITY COUNCIL
Forty-ninth year

Letter dated 21 February 1994 from the Permanent Representative of
the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the United Nations
addressed to the Secretary-General

I have the honour to forward to you the memorandum issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 18 February 1994 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the text of the present letter and its annex circulated as an official document of the General Assembly, under items 64 and 65 of the preliminary list, and of the Security Council.

(Signed) PAK Gil Yon
Ambassador
Permanent Representative

* A/49/50.

ANNEX

Memorandum issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the
Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 18 February 1994

**TRUE PICTURE OF PRODUCTION OF PLUTONIUM
FROM PHWRs IN SOUTH KOREA**

It is a worldwide-known fact that the successive rulers in south Korea have long carried forward their clandestine programme for the development of nuclear weapons under the U.S. "nuclear umbrella."

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea issued its memorandum early last year, disclosing south Korea's nuclear weapons development programme.

Many governments, political parties, public organizations and the world community at large have expressed great concern over the south Korean authorities' machinations for nuclear weapons development and demanded their immediate discontinuation. This notwithstanding, the south Korean authorities have refused to comply with this demand and stepped up their nuclear weapons development at accelerated pace.

In connection with another revelation of the fact that the south Korean authorities have recently increased plutonium output from their pressurized heavy water reactor (PHWR) for the development of nuclear weapons, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is issuing this memorandum, considering it necessary to disclose the true picture thereof.

**I. The South Korean Authorities' Nuclear Weapons
Development Policy and Introduction of PHWR**

South Korea's nuclear weapons development policy was shaped in the early 1970s.

The 1960s witnessed a rapid collapse of the imperialists' colonial system in different parts of the world, that gave way to a chain of the declaration of independence by countries under the colonial domination. In the 1970s, the suzerain states moved toward withdrawing their troops from their former colonies.

Critically ill at ease over these moves, the former dictator Park Chung Hee tried to find a way out in developing nuclear weapons.

A former aide close to the "Chongwadae" testified that Park Chung Hee "concluded that the last resort for self-reliant national defence capability is the acquisition of nuclear weapons." (South Korean monthly magazine Shin Dong-a, April issue of 1989).

Recalling this period, a south Korean newspaper reported that "with all testimonies pieced together, Park Chung Hee seemed to have taken a 'shortcut' toward the acquisition of

nuclear weapons by the mid-1970s." (South Korean newspaper Chungang Ilbo, August 6, 1992)

As Park Chung Hee committed himself to the nuclear development policy, his primary preoccupation was to obtain access to the nuclear explosive substances and introduce the PHWR to this end.

The south Korean monthly magazine Wolgan Choson in its August issue of 1988 commented that "Park Chung Hee forcefully suppressed the anti-PHWR voice within his 'government' and ordered chairman Moon Choong Shik of the 'Korea Electric Power Corporation' (KEPOC) to resolutely push forward the introduction of the PHWR. This seemed to reflect his preoccupation with the nuclear arms development".

The same magazine in its October issue of 1991 wrote that "a person, once deeply engaged in the nuclear development programme, admitted that the introduction of the Wolsong PHWR from Canada was aimed at manufacturing nuclear weapons."

Even a physicist who remembers the PHWR introduction asserted that "the PHWR introduction is apparently related to the nuclear weapons development." (South Korean monthly magazine Shin Dong-a, April issue of 1989). South Korea embarked on a pilot-production of nuclear weapons through PHWR as early as in the late 1970s. These attempts by south Korea to develop nuclear weapons escalated during the years of the Chun Doo Hwan "regime".

On December 19, 1980, Chun Doo Hwan took the "measure of merging and dissolving the 'government'-subsidized agencies", a camouflage to feign the abandonment of nuclear weapons development scheme, but in fact "maximized their research capability." (South Korean Yonhap yearbook, 1981 edition)

In September 1983, Lee Ki Baek, the then "Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the 'ROK' Army", submitted his "verbal report on the nuclear policy" of south Korea to Chun Doo Hwan, and this was the occasion for the evolution of the "secretly planned strategy for nuclear arms option," which has since been vigorously promoted". (South Korean monthly magazine Wolgan Choson, October issue of 1991)

Under the cloak of the "localization of nuclear fuel," the Chun Doo Hwan military "regime" succeeded in developing the PHWR nuclear fuel in 1986 and completed its experimental facilities for processing the PHWR nuclear fuel in 1987. This process has enabled the "regime" to move toward the goal of an independent capability of producing the total amount of nuclear fuel needed for the Wolsong PHWR and at the same time toward the stage of perfecting the technology of reprocessing the spent fuel.

The Roh Tae Woo military "regime" stepped into a full-scale stage of achieving a greater practicability of the industrial foundation of its nuclear weapons development programme by completing this foundation.

Stressing the need to "actively meet the fast-changing situation", Roh Tae Woo had the "Taedok Declaration" adopted pledging to complete by 1992 the project of the "Taedok science town", general headquarters of the nuclear weapons development programme, 4 or 5 years ahead of schedule, and on November 27, 1992 he officiated at the dedication ceremony of the town project. (South Korean Dong-a yearbook, 1991 edition, NBC television, November 27, 1992)

Throughout the process of their nuclear weapons development, the present south Korean authorities attempted to divert the world public attention from their telltale nuclear arms programme under the cloak of the light water reactors (LWR) system. In face of the

mounting international public opinion against south Korea's increasing moves towards nuclear weapons development. Kim Young Sam tried to whitewash such moves, saying that they "have no intention at all to go ahead with any independent nuclear weapons development programme". (South Korean radio no. 1, November 14, 1993)

South Korean authorities' decision to introduce the PHWR was "motivated by the analysis which indicates a higher purity of plutonium from the reprocessed natural uranium as compared with the spent enriched uranium." (South Korean monthly magazine Wolgan Choson, April issue of 1992)

The south Korean monthly magazine Wolgan Choson in its November issue of 1989 quoted the chairman of south Korea's non-governmental "council for atomic power development and safety" as saying in the early 1970s that "the Canadian deuterium-uranium (CANDU)-type PHWR is fuelled by natural uranium, which we can supply on our own".

The PHWR introduction is also aimed at circumventing the supervision by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

A south Korean physicist who remembers the period of the PHWR introduction confessed that "the IAEA's supervision is almost difficult, because the PHWR leaves room for a random fuel discharge." (South Korean monthly magazine Shin Dong-a, April issue of 1989)

As seen in the above, the Wolsong PHWR is a pile geared to plutonium production which the south Korean authorities have commissioned into operation in pursuit of their policy intention to develop nuclear weapons.

II. The Stockpiling of Plutonium through the PHWR and Completion of System for the Full-scale Nuclear Weapons Development

The Wolsong PHWR plays a pivotal role in the south Korean authorities' nuclear weapons development programme.

Under a south Korean-Canadian December 1974 contract, the Wolsong PHWR project began in January 1976 and went into operation in April 1983.

At present, south Korea has the Wolsong PHWR, the multi-purpose research reactors (K-NRR) and post irradiation test facilities in operation as an integral centre of the plutonium production.

The amount of nuclear material from a 1,000 mwe PHWR after one year operation is enough to manufacture around 50 atomic bombs of Nagasaki type.

Therefore, it follows that the 678.7 mwe PHWR operating in south Korea since 1983 has by now produced potential plutonium enough to manufacture over 370 atomic bombs.

The U.S. newspaper International Herald Tribune on November 2, 1993 said that south Korea is speeding up its ambitious nuclear programme under IAEA "safeguards," and further wrote that "experts estimate that its accumulated spent fuel would yield about 10 tons of plutonium if reprocessed. This stockpile of potential plutonium will increase to an estimated 24 tons by the year 2,000."

This was pointed out also by the Japanese magazine *Sekai* in its December issue of 1992, which reported that south Korea has stockpiled about 10 tons of plutonium extracted from the spent fuel.

Quite obvious is how much the stockpile of plutonium will bulk up, when another PHWR now under construction is commissioned into operation.

South Korea is speeding up its projects to build more PHWRs in an effort to extract more plutonium under the pretext of reprocessing 300 tons of spent fuel annually discharged from eight LWRs currently in operation plus 1,140 tons of spent fuel contained in underwater storage to be recycled back into these PHWRs.

Commenting on this, south Korean newspaper *Hangyore Sinmun* reported on March 15, 1990 that the south Korean authorities were planning to recycle the LWR spent fuel into low-enriched PHWR fuel blended with other uranium waste, a move "implicative of their military consideration reflected by their intention to build more PHWR power plants that allow an easier extraction of plutonium."

Peter Hayes, an anti-nuclear activist, wrote in his essay, entitled "the Republic of Korea and the nuclear issue," that "it is evident that the south Koreans have not abandoned the idea of reprocessing their spent fuel. In October, 1989, south Korea began informal discussions to organize a trilateral arrangement involving south Korea, the United States, and Canada, whereby coprocessing would be established in south Korea.

Also in October, 1989 an IAEA seminar in Vienna was told by a KEPCO official that south Korea wants to install more PHWRs. A south Korean official added at the same meeting that south Korea would like to reprocess LWR spent fuel for recycling plutonium back into these PHWRs."

The point at issue is that the spent nuclear fuel from the PHWR is diverted directly into manufacturing nuclear weapons after its conversion into plutonium through the undisclosed reprocessing facility at the "Taedok science town."

III. The PHWRs Must be Replaced by the LWRs.

The south Korean authorities have given the United States *carte blanche* to deploy numerous nuclear weapons in south Korea and meanwhile, on their part, actively pushed ahead with their own nuclear weapons development programme, and they are planning these days to introduce even "patriot" missiles.

This graphically testifies to a sheer incongruity of their words and deeds, allegedly devoted to the implementation of the "Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula".

Now, south Korea is practically moving toward invalidating the "Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula".

In this regard, an American scholar Selig S. Harrison wrote in his comment that "criticism of the agreement has intensified in south Korea since Mr. Roh left office. One of the key advisers to President Kim Young Sam, Chung Jey Moon, Chairman of the 'National Assembly's Foreign Affairs and Unification Committee' has called for a review of the 1991 agreement. "We know that we could generate nuclear power at a lower cost if we have

/...

reprocessing facilities,' Mr. Chung said last May, 'and we cannot continue to depend on foreign countries for nuclear fuel.'" (U.S. newspaper International Herald Tribune, November 2, 1993)

The increasingly undisguised efforts on the part of the south Korean authorities to invalidate the "Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula" have further intensified recently, simultaneously with the on-going ruckus over the DPRK's so-called "suspected nuclear programme".

South Korea's former "Minister of National Unification" Lee Se Ghee said in April 1993 that "the 'North-South Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization' has been invalidated in principle," and went the length of insisting that "it is high time we have to acquire nuclear weapons capability, and the 'National Assembly' should raise voice calling for this." (South Korean newspaper Dong-a Ilbo, April 11, 1993)

South Korean "NKC television" reported on October 9, 1993 that some observers speculated that Kim Young Sam called a "security-related Ministers" meeting, unusually attended by the "Minister of Science and Technology," and the meeting discussed matters related to the "acquisition of nuclear fuel reprocessing facilities" and to the "review of the 'Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula.'"

It has become a stark fact that the persistent dustup by the south Korean authorities over the DPRK's so-called "suspected nuclear programme" is, after all, intended to justify their attempts to develop nuclear weapons.

Commenting on this, the Romanian weekly Europa in its edition no. 152 disclosed that "the south Korean authorities' kickup over the north's 'suspected nuclear programme' is part of their propaganda offensive to legalize their own nuclear weapons development."

The Canada-based overseas Koreans' newspaper New Korea Times commented on October 23, 1993 that "particularly, the voice of the new right-wing forces in south Korea calling for the possession of nuclear weapons was high in intensity and the opposition response was no less tough. As if reflecting such pros and cons, south Korea's nuclear independence turned out to be a favorite topic in the 'national assembly' as well".

These facts alone suffice to show that the south Korean authorities are dashing headlong toward nuclear weapons development, unconcerned with the "Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula," which they have now rendered worthless.

The south Korean authorities must renounce their "nuclear weapons development policy" for the denuclearization of the Korean peninsula, remove the nuclear materials they have already produced or brought from other countries, and take urgent measures either to dismantle their PHWRs both in operation and under construction or to replace them with LWRs.



Security Council

Distr.
GENERAL

S/1994/205
22 February 1994

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

LETTER DATED 21 FEBRUARY 1994 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I.
OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF AZERBAIJAN TO THE UNITED NATIONS
ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

I have the honour to transmit herewith the texts of a Statement by the
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Azerbaijani Republic, issued on
21 February 1994 (see annex).

I should be grateful if you would have the present letter circulated as a
document of the Security Council.

(Signed) Yashar T. ALIYEV
Chargé d'affaires a.i.

Annex

[Original: Russian]

STATEMENT BY THE MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE
AZERBAIJANI REPUBLIC

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Azerbaijani Republic wishes to draw attention to a dangerous turn of events in the region caused by a fresh escalation of aggression by the Republic of Armenia against the Azerbaijani Republic.

The Republic of Armenia is not desisting from its efforts to occupy more territory in the Azerbaijani Republic, and is expanding its military presence in the occupied Nagorny Karabakh region. Seeking to conceal its true goal of annexing the occupied territories, the Republic of Armenia has recently stepped up its campaign of propaganda in order to misinform the world community.

To that end, all possible means are being used to discredit the peace policy of Azerbaijan, which is aimed exclusively at eliminating, as soon as possible, the consequences of the aggression by the Republic of Armenia, as a prerequisite for finding a comprehensive solution to the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict.

Refuting the insinuations in the propaganda disseminated by the Republic of Armenia, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs declares that Azerbaijan welcomes the peace initiatives of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, and hopes that the forthcoming visit to this region by the new Chairman of the CSCE Peace Conference in Minsk will represent a significant step towards the attainment of a comprehensive political settlement of the conflict between the Republic of Armenia and the Azerbaijani Republic.

The Azerbaijani leadership has repeatedly presented initiatives for concluding a cease-fire agreement and has systematically supported such initiatives by international organizations and various States, which should lead to a cessation of hostilities. These peaceful intentions by the Azerbaijani leadership have been single-mindedly and consistently frustrated by the Republic of Armenia, which is seeking a further escalation of military tension in the region, with the aim of realizing its crazy dream of establishing a "Greater Armenia".

Azerbaijan therefore again appeals to the world community and international organizations to condemn emphatically the policy of aggression pursued by the Republic of Armenia, a policy that is dooming the Azerbaijani people to further sacrifice and suffering.

21 February 1994

